

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action dated October 16, 2006, claims 17-31 were allowed and claims 1-16 were rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,584,329 to Wendelrup et al (“Wendelrup”).
- Claims 11, 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wendelrup in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,017 to Lebby et al. (“Lebby”).
- Claims 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wendelrup in view of alleged well-known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant canceled claims 6 and 13 without prejudice or disclaimer and amended claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 14, and 16. Applicant adds new claim 32. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-32 are now pending in this application.

Amended Independent Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the Art of Record

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Wendelrup. Claims 11, 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wendelrup in view of Lebby. Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 11 to incorporate the subject matter from claims 6 and 13, respectively. Applicant respectively submits that independent claims 1 and 11, as amended, are patentable over Wendelrup in view of Lebby. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration with regard to the rejection of the subject matter from claim 6 and 13, respectively.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites that a battery pack device for a mobile communication terminal includes a transmitter/receiver such that:

the transmitter/receiver includes a coil arranged in the form of a plate extending along a coupling surface of the battery pack device to be coupled

with a facing coupling surface of the terminal body so that it faces a coil arranged at the coupling surface of the terminal body in a state in which the battery pack device is coupled to the terminal body, thereby forming a transformer.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Wendelrup, nor Lebby, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest a transmitter/receiver with at least the above-recited features. First, no coil, much less a coil in the form of a plate, is taught or suggested in Wendelrup. Second no coil, much less a coil in the form of a plate, is taught or suggested in Lebby. The term “plate” is only mentioned in Lebby at column 5, lines 25-38 in the following excerpt:

As illustrated, power source with digital signal transceiving electronics 28 is detachably mounted to analog signal communicator 22 using a snap-fit connections 38. More specifically, power source 28 is mounted to a battery mounting receptacle/plate (not shown) utilizing a plurality of snap-fit connections 38 so as to align a battery contact plate (not shown) located on power source with digital signal transceiving electronics 28 with the contact plate of the battery receptacle/plate located on analog signal communicator 22, thereby achieving an electrical contact interface between power source with digital signal transceiving electronics 28 and analog signal communicator 22 and forming dual system portable electronic communicator 20. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Lebby that any one of the receptacle/plate and the contact plate includes a coil in the form of a plate.

Moreover, pages 6-7 of the Office Action pointed to Figure 5 (element 68) and at column 6, lines 22-56 of Lebby for allegedly disclosing a battery pack “wherein the transmitter/receiver is inherently a coil arranged in the form of a plate extending along a coupling surface of the battery pack device.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Lebby merely recites the following with respect to the element 68:

More particularly, power source with digital signal transceiving electronics 54, receives a digital signal through digital signal transceiving electronics 62. The digital signals are subsequently converted by converter 64 to analog signals which are submitted to analog signal communicator 52 through a wireless interface 68. During transmission, analog signals generated by analog signal transceiving electronics 56 are submitted to converter 64 through wireless interface 68 and converted to digital signals. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited excerpt of a transmitter/receiver including a coil arranged in the form of a plate as recited in independent claim 1. To the extent that the wireless interface 68 would include a coil, there is no teaching or suggestion in Lebby, or Wendelrup, that such a coil is arranged in the form of a plate as recited in independent claim 1, as amended. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Wendelrup in view of Lebby. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 11 was amended to incorporate the subject matter from claim 13 to recite that a mobile communication terminal includes a transmitter/receiver such that:

the transmitter/receiver includes a coil arranged in the form of a plate extending along a coupling surface of the terminal body to be coupled with a facing coupling surface of the battery pack device so that it faces a coil arranged at the coupling surface of the battery pack device in a state in which the battery pack device is coupled to the terminal body, thereby forming a transformer.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11, as amended, is patentable over Wendelrup in view of Lebby for at least the same reason reasons as set forth above with regard to independent claim 1. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 11 be withdrawn.

All Pending Claims Should be Allowed

The rejections of claims 6 and 13 are now moot in light of the cancellation of these claims.

The pending dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, and 14-16 should be allowed at least because of their dependence upon allowable independent claims 1 and 11, respectively, and for the additional features that they recite, respectively.

New Claim 32 is allowable over the art of record

Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 32 is allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections, and the allowance of all pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-32. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: February 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Baldine B. Paul

Registration No.: 54,369

SEYFARTH SHAW

815 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. – Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 2006-4004

(202) 463-2400 – Telephone
(202) 955-3133- Facsimile